

REMARKS

The applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed on January 11, 2006. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 12-13 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,767,141 to Dudek et al. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10-11 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,767,141 to Dudek et al.


The Examiner indicates that Dudek discloses canals within a substrate, and identifies element 238 of Dudek shown in Figure 29 as teaching canals. The applicant has amended claims 9 and 16 to recite grooves, not canals, to clarify that the claimed features formed in the surface of the substrate, grooves, are not holes. Rather, they are grooves accessible from a surface of the substrate into which alignment pins, for example, may be placed. Dudek does not teach a substrate with such grooves and thus does not anticipate or present a prima facie case of obviousness for independent claims 9 or 16, or claims depending therefrom.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions about this Amendment and to facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

Dated: 7/11/06

By: 
Robert C. Bertin, Registration No. 41,488
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500 Telephone
(202) 295-8478 Facsimile